



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/550,651	04/17/2000	Iqbal M. Dar	CNA-025	1377

2292 7590 11/14/2003

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

BALI, VIKKRAM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2623

DATE MAILED: 11/14/2003

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/550,651

Applicant(s)

DAR, IQBAL M.

Examiner

Vikkram Bali

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2623

DETAILED ACTION

In response to the reply filled on 8/8/2003, the all the amendments have been entered and the action follows:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2, 5-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bailey et al (US 4924087).

With respect to claim 1, Bailey discloses a fiber optic inspection system that includes a camera for imaging (see 6, numerical 270) and a motion system that translate the motion of fiber (see figure 6, numerical 222, 228, 270 and col. 4, lines 58-66 and col. 5, lines 4-8, the fiber optic travels between the reels 222 and 228 and the camera takes the image of the fiber optic. However, he fails to disclose the motion system, as claimed. But, it is suggested in the col. 5, lines 1-3, that a motor is present, which is not shown. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the

Art Unit: 2623

art at the time of invention to simply take the suggestion and add the motor to move the reels.

With respect to claims 2 and 10 it is well known in the art to use an auto focus camera and a magnetic coil motor. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of invention to use a camera which is auto focus and a motor which is magnetic coil as this is done conventionally and readily available in the market to use and does give great results.

With respect to claim 5, he further discloses a base frame holding the fiber and a linear motor attached to the base plate, (see figure 6, there is some sort of frame on which the inspection system is held) as claimed.

With respect to claim 6, it's a design choice to have the motor to any side of the frame depending upon the ease of conducting the inspection.

With respect to claim 7 and 8, he further discloses the calibrated slot in the base plate and the alignment pins for aligning the fiber, (see figure 6 numerical 224 and 226 before the inspection to align the fiber for the inspection) as claimed.

With respect to claim 9, he further discloses the encoder which checks the operation, (see figure 250 and the col. 4 last line through col. 5, first 5 lines a computer for controlling the operation) as claimed.

3. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bailey in view of Norton (US 4139306).

With respect to claims 3 and 4, Bailey discloses the invention substantially as disclose and as described above in claim 1. However, he fails to disclose, two cameras and the top camera take top and the bottom camera takes bottom image, as claimed. Norton in inspection system teaches the placement of inspection sensors as two cameras and the top camera take top and the bottom camera takes bottom image, (see col. 2, lines 40-45) as claimed.

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the two references as they are analogous because they are solving the similar problem of inspection. The placement of sensors i.e. cameras as taught by Norton can easily be introduced in to the Bailey's fiber inspection system. The modification will provide an image from all the circumference of the fiber.

Claims 11-18 are rejected for the same reasons as set forth for the claims 1-10 as claims 11-18 are the method claims for the system as claimed in claims 1-10.

Art Unit: 2623

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vikkram Bali whose telephone number is 703.305.4510. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM - 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amelia Au can be reached on 703.308.6604. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703.872.9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703.306.0377.

Vikkram Bali
Examiner
Art Unit 2623



vb